

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
EASTERN DIVISION**

CLIFTON FREEMAN	§ § § § § § § §	PETITIONER
v.		Civil No. 2:25cv13-HSO-ASH
COVINGTON COUNTY JUSTICE COURT, et al.		RESPONDENTS

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S [18] REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION, AND DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS [1] WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation [18] of United States Magistrate Judge Andrew S. Harris, entered in this case on July 2, 2025. Petitioner Clifton Freeman has not filed an Objection to the Report and Recommendation [18], and the time for doing so has passed. After due consideration of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation [18], the record, and relevant legal authority, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation [18] should be adopted, and that Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [1] should be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with multiple Court Orders.

I. BACKGROUND

On October 15, 2024, Petitioner Clifton Freeman (“Petitioner” or “Freeman”) was arrested following a traffic stop. See Pet. [1] at 1. He alleges that he is “currently facing unjust criminal charges in the Covington County Justice Court.”

Id. On February 4, 2025, Freeman filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. As the Magistrate Judge detailed in his July 2, 2025, Report and Recommendation [18], Petitioner has repeatedly ignored and refused to comply with the Court's Orders and its repeated warnings that failure to comply would result in the dismissal of this case. *See* R. & R. [18] at 2-4. The Magistrate Judge recommends that Freeman's Petition [1] be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with multiple Court Orders under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the Court's inherent authority to dismiss an action sua sponte. *See id.* at 3-4.

On July 2, 2025, the Report and Recommendation [18] was electronically mailed to Petitioner through the Court's CM/ECF system at his e-mail address of record. *See* Doc. [3] (pro se registration for electronic receipt of Court filings). Petitioner has not filed any objection to the Report and Recommendation [18], and the time for doing so has passed.

II. DISCUSSION

Where no party has objected to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of it. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made."). In such cases, the Court applies the "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law" standard of review. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).

Having conducted the required review, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's findings are not clearly erroneous, nor are they an abuse of discretion or contrary to law. *See id.* Dismissal without prejudice is warranted. The Court will adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [18] as the opinion of this Court and dismiss the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [1] without prejudice for failure to comply with multiple Court Orders.

III. CONCLUSION

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that, the Report and Recommendation [18] of United States Magistrate Judge Andrew S. Harris, entered in this case on July 2, 2025, is **ADOPTED** in its entirety as the finding of this Court.

IT IS, FURTHER, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that, Petitioner Clifton Freeman's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [1] is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to comply with multiple Court Orders.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED, this the 25th day of July, 2025.

s/ Halil Suleyman Ozerden

HALIL SULEYMAN OZERDEN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE